



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/067,950	02/08/2002	Toru Kambayashi	219406US2SRD	6644

22850 7590 01/13/2006

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

NALVEN, ANDREW L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2134

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/067,950	Applicant(s) KAMBAYASHI, TORU	
	Examiner Andrew L. Nalven	Art Unit 2134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/19/2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 9 and 10 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 5-8, 11-17 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 9 and 10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/14/02</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-4 and 9-10 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 19 October 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
3. Applicant's election with traverse of the invention of group I, claims 1-2 and 9-10, in the reply filed on 19 October 2005 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that it would not be an undue burden to examine all of the initially presented claims. This is not found persuasive because the claims have acquired a separate status in the art by way of their separate classifications and this indicates that an undue burden would exist in searching all claims.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 1 states "a device information generating unit configured to generate a device information." This appears to be grammatically incorrect. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Art Unit: 2134

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-2 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shimbo et al US Patent No. 6,185,680.

7. With regards to claims 1 and 9, Shimbo teaches a device key matrix storage unit configured to store a device key matrix in which device keys are arranged in a two-dimensional manner (Shimbo, column 21 lines 1-10, Figure 6), a device key selecting unit configured to select device keys according to a device ID, each device key being selected from device keys in each one dimensional array of the device key matrix according to each numeral of a device ID (Shimbo, column 21 lines 35-43), and a device information generating unit configured to generate a device information based on the selected device keys and the device ID (Shimbo, column 21 lines 11-15).

8. With regards to claims 2 and 10, Shimbo teaches the device key-generating unit selecting a device key from the device keys in each row of the device key matrix according to each numeral of the device ID (Shimbo, column 22 lines 4-15).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimbo et al US Patent No. 6,185,680 in view of Bleichenbacher et al US Patent No. 6,753,313.

11. With regards to claim 3, Shimbo fails to teach calculating a path function value based on the selected device key, the path function indicating a path of the device ID in a tree formed of all possible combinations of the numerals forming the device ID. Bleichenbacher teaches calculating a path function value based on the selected device key, the path function indicating a path of the device ID in a tree formed of all possible combinations of the numerals forming the device ID (Bleichenbacher, column 6 lines 20-48). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Bleichenbacher's path function method with Shimbo's key management system because it offers the advantage of allowing derivation of an encryption key from only a program identifier thus reducing the required size of a program header (Bleichenbacher, column 2 lines 44-57).

12. With regards to claim 4, Shimbo as modified teaches the selecting of a device key from the device keys in each row of the device key matrix according to each numeral of the device ID (Shimbo, column 22 lines 4-15).


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew L. Nalven whose telephone number is 571 272 3839. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 8-6, Alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached on 571 272 3838. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Andrew Nalven



GREGORY MORSE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100